

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

DAVID ANDREW RENSON,
#1839989,

Plaintiff,

V.

LORIE DAVIS, et al.,

Defendants.

[illegible]

Case No. 6:20-cv-297-JDK-JDL

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On September 14, 2020, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 10). The Report recommended that Plaintiff's civil rights claims against Director of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice-Correctional Institutions Division Lorie Davis, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton, and the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles in their official capacities for monetary damages be dismissed without prejudice for want of jurisdiction. The Report further recommended that the remainder of Plaintiff's claims be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1). Plaintiff timely filed objections (Docket No. 12). The Court reviews objected-to portions of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation de novo. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings and recommendations to which objection is

made.”). The Court conducting a de novo review examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).


Having reviewed Plaintiff’s objections de novo, the Court concludes that the objections are without merit and that the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct. It is accordingly

ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (Docket No. 10) is **ADOPTED**. It is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff’s claims against Defendants Davis, Paxton, and the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles in their official capacities for monetary damages are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for want of jurisdiction. It is further

ORDERED that the remainder of Plaintiff’s claims are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1).

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **6th** day of **October, 2020**.



JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE